



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,207	02/06/2002	Dorrish L. Page	WDF-69436	1325

7590 03/31/2004

Oral Caglar
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton
48th Floor
333 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071

EXAMINER

TRAN, DIEM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3748

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/831,207

Applicant(s)

PAGE ET AL.

Examiner

Diem Tran

Art Unit

3748

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 34,35,53 and 54 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14,19-30,32,33,36-42 and 45-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 15-18,31,43 and 44 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 12, 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

-It appears that claims 12-13 should depend from claim 11 since the "diesel oxidation catalyst" is not recited until claim 11. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 11-13, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zirkel (US Patent 5,335,492).

Regarding claims 1, 11, Zirkel discloses an apparatus for processing a fluid stream, comprising:

a heat exchanger having first and second spaced-apart walls that define an inlet passage (9) and an outlet passage (7) for the fluid stream, wherein the walls are configured to transfer heat from the outlet passage to the inlet passage (see Figure 2); and a diesel particulate filter (1) integrally connected to the heat exchanger and positioned to transmit the fluid stream from the inlet passage to the outlet passage,

Art Unit: 3748

wherein the diesel particulate filter is configured to oxidize carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, and to collect and oxidize particulate matter present in the fluid stream.

Regarding claims 2-4, Zirkel further discloses that the diesel particulate filter is a ceramic wall-flow particulate filter comprises a material of metal (see Figure 1, abstract, lines 1-5).

Regarding claims 12, 13, Zirkel further discloses that the diesel oxidation catalyst comprises metal foam.

Regarding claim 19, Zirkel further discloses that a resistance heater configured to heat the fluid stream in the inlet passage (see col. 2, lines 9-15).

Claims 36-38, 41-42, 45-47, 49, 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anguil (US Patent 5,143,700).

Regarding claims 36, 37, 46, Anguil discloses a method for processing a fluid stream, comprising:

preheating the fluid stream by heat exchange using an exiting treated fluid stream; and oxidizing carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, and reducing nitrogen oxides present in the preheated fluid stream, to produce the exiting treated fluid stream (see Figure 1, col. 3, lines 4-10).

Regarding claims 38, 47, Anguil further discloses oxidizing carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons present in the preheated fluid stream is performed using a diesel oxidation catalyst (see col. 2, lines 57-63).

Regarding claims 41, 49, Anguil further discloses injecting hydrocarbon into the preheated fluid stream (see col. 2, lines 63-68).

Regarding claims 42, 50, Anguil further discloses injecting hydrocarbon into the preheated fluid stream comprises measuring the temperature at a point in the preheated fluid stream; and controlling the rate at which hydrocarbon is injected into the preheated fluid stream based upon the measured temperature (see Figure 1, col. 2, lines 63-68).

Regarding claim 45, Anguil further discloses preheating the fluid stream using an external heat source prior to preheating using the exiting treated fluid stream.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zirkel (US Patent 5,335,492).

Zirkel discloses an oxidation catalyst; however, fails to disclose the catalyst comprises a material selected from the group of platinum, palladium, and ceramic oxide.

It is well known to those with ordinary skill in the art that an oxidation catalyst comprises at least one of Pt, Pd. Therefore, such disclosure by Zirkel is notoriously well known in the art so as to be proper for official notice.

Claims 1-4, 11-13, 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cleary (US Patent 5,326,537) in view of Zirkel (US Patent 5,335,492).

Regarding claims 1, 11, Cleary discloses an apparatus for processing a fluid stream, comprising:

a heat exchanger having first and second spaced-apart walls that define an inlet passage and an outlet passage for the fluid stream, wherein the walls are configured to transfer heat from the outlet passage to the inlet passage (see Figure 4); and an oxidation catalyst integrally connected to the heat exchanger to oxidize hydrocarbons, and positioned to transmit the fluid stream from the inlet passage to the outlet passage (see col. 8, lines 64-67); however, fails to disclose a diesel particulate filter for collecting and oxidizing particulate matter present in the fluid stream. Zirkel teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize a diesel particulate filter (1) for collecting and oxidizing particulate matter present in the fluid stream (see Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized the teaching of Zirkel in the Cleary device, since the use thereof would have reduced particulate matter in the exhaust gas.

Regarding claims 2-4, Zirkel further teaches that the diesel particulate filter is a ceramic wall-flow particulate filter comprises a material of metal (see Figure 2, abstract, lines 1-5).

Regarding claims 11-13, Cleary further discloses that the diesel oxidation catalyst comprises metal foam.

Regarding claim 19, Cleary further discloses that a resistance heater configured to heat the fluid stream in the inlet passage.

Regarding claim 20, Cleary further discloses that the first and second spaced-apart walls have a spiral configuration (see Figure 4).

Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zirkel as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Schluter (US Patent 5,814,284).

Regarding claims 6-8, Zirkel discloses all the claimed limitations as applied to claim 1 above, however, fails to disclose a lean-NOx catalyst located upstream of the diesel oxidation catalyst wherein the lean-NOx catalyst is configured to reduce nitrogen oxides in the stream. Schluter teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize a NOx catalyst to reduce NOx in the exhaust gas (see col. 4, lines 29-34).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used the NOx catalyst taught by Schluter in the Zirkel device, since the use thereof would have eliminated harmful NOx emission in the exhaust gas.

Zirkel discloses the claimed invention except for locating the NOx catalyst upstream of the oxidation catalyst. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate the NOx catalyst at the location upstream of the oxidation catalyst in the Zirkel apparatus, since it has been

Art Unit: 3748

held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Regarding claims 9-10, Schluter teaches a NOx catalyst, but fails to disclose that said NOx catalyst has a monolithic structure.

It is well known to those with ordinary skill in the art that NOx catalyst has a monolithic structure, is notoriously well known in the art so as to be proper for official notice.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cleary (US Patent 5,326,537) in view of Zirkel (US Patent 5,335,492) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Anguil (US Patent 5,143,700).

The modified Cleary apparatus disclose all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 1 above, however, fails to disclose a fuel injector located and configured to inject hydrocarbons into the inlet passage. Anguil teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize a fuel injector located and configured to inject hydrocarbons into the inlet passage (see col. 2, lines 63-68).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized the teaching of Anguil in the modified Cleary apparatus, since the use thereof would have improved the efficiency of the emission control system.

Claims 21-27, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cleary (US Patent 5,326,537) in view of Schluter (US Patent 5,814,284).

Regarding claims 21, 24, 25, Cleary discloses an apparatus for processing a fluid stream, comprising:

a heat exchanger having first and second spaced-apart walls that define an inlet passage and an outlet passage for the fluid stream, wherein the walls are configured to transfer heat from the outlet passage to the inlet passage (see Figure 4);

a diesel oxidation catalyst integrally connected to the heat exchanger, between the inlet and outlet passage, wherein the diesel oxidation catalyst is configured to oxidize carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons in the fluid stream; however, fails to disclose a lean-NOx catalyst located upstream of the diesel oxidation catalyst wherein the lean-NOx catalyst is configured to reduce nitrogen oxides in the stream. Schluter teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize a NOx catalyst to reduce NOx in the exhaust gas (see col. 4, lines 29-34).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used the NOx catalyst taught by Schluter in the Cleary device, since the use thereof would have eliminated harmful NOx emission in the exhaust gas.

Cleary discloses the claimed invention except for locating the NOx catalyst upstream of the oxidation catalyst. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate the NOx catalyst at the location upstream of the oxidation catalyst in the Cleary apparatus, since it has been

Art Unit: 3748

held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Regarding claims 22, 23, Cleary further discloses that the diesel oxidation catalyst comprises metal foam.

Regarding claims 26, 27, Schluter teaches a NOx catalyst, but fails to disclose that said NOx catalyst has a monolithic structure.

It is well known to those with ordinary skill in the art that NOx catalyst has a monolithic structure, is notoriously well known in the art so as to be proper for official notice.

Regarding claim 32, Cleary further discloses that a resistance heater configured to heat the fluid stream in the inlet passage.

Regarding claim 33, Cleary further discloses that the first and second spaced apart walls have a spiral configuration (see Figure 4).

Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cleary (US Patent 5,326,537) in view of Schluter (US Patent 5,814,284) as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Anguil (US Patent 5,143,700).

Regarding claims 28-30, the modified Cleary apparatus disclose all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 21 above, however, fails to disclose a temperature sensor and a controller, responsive to the temperature signal, for controlling the rate at which the fuel injector injects hydrocarbons into the inlet passage. Anguil teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize a temperature sensor at a position adjacent to the

Art Unit: 3748

oxidation catalyst and a controller, responsive to the temperature signal, for controlling the rate at which the fuel injector injects hydrocarbons into the inlet passage (see col. 2, lines 63-68).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized the teaching of Anguil in the modified Cleary apparatus, since the use thereof would have improved the fuel consumption for reducing harmful emissions in the exhaust gas.

Claims 39, 40, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anguil (US Patent 5,143,700) in view of Schluter (US Patent 5,814,284).

Regarding claim 39, 40, 48, Anguil discloses all the claimed limitations as discussed in claims 36, 46 above, however, fails to disclose reducing nitrogen oxides present in the preheated fluid stream using a lean-NOx catalyst. Schluter teaches that it is conventional in the art, to reduce nitrogen oxides present in the preheated fluid stream using a lean-NOx catalyst (see Figure 4, col. 4, lines 29-32).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized the teaching of Schluter in the Anguil device, since the use thereof would have improved the NOx purification efficiency of the catalyst.

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 3748

Claims 15-18, 31, 43, 44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 34, 35, 53-54 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Diem Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-6073. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday from 8:30 a.m.- 5:00p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas E. Denion, can be reached on (703) 308-2623. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.



Diem Tran
Patent Examiner
Art unit 3748

DT
March 18, 2004



THOMAS DENION
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700